

REMARKS

Substance of Examiner Interview

An Examiner Interview took place on 02/09/2006. The participants were (1) Examiner Patrice L. Winder and (2) Keith W. Saunders.

As indicated on the PTOL-413A that was submitted on 02/07/2006, the rejection of claims 1-20 under U.S. Patent No. 5,845,283 (Williams et al.) was discussed. The indicated "Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:" was:

In Williams, conversion of data conversion device 22 is accomplished within conversion engine 23. The message interfaces (MIs) 28 only decide which conversion routine library 23a will be used. (Col. 5/LI. 1-21 & Col. 6/LI. 44-65) Contrast with Specification of Application, e.g., Page 6/Lines 12-20 and Page 10/Lines 7-14.

It is the understanding of Applicants' representative that the Examiner agreed that the conversion in Williams et al. occurs within "conversion engine 23" and not within the "message interfaces (MIs) 28".

It was agreed that the claims would be amended to better reflect that conversion occurs within the "plug-in modules" 120, 122, and 124 instead of within the "parsing engine" 126. (Instant Patent Application, Figure 3)

1 Current Office Action

2 The current and Final Office Action was dated (mailed) 12/09/2005. This
3 current Office Action examined claims 1-20.
4

5 Applicant's representative notes with appreciation the inclusion of an
6 initialed and signed PTO-1449 as requested in a previous Reply.
7

8 Generally, the current Office Action rejected claims 1-20.

9 Specifically, the current Office Action indicated the following:

10 Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing
11 to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains
12 subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to
13 reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the
14 time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.
Applicant's disclosure does not describe "plugged-in". Applicant's disclosure
describes loading plug-in modules.

15 Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by
16 Williams et al., USPN 5,845,283 (hereafter referred to as Williams).

17 Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
18 over Williams in view of O'Brien et al., USPN 6,795,809 B2 (hereafter referred
19 to as O'Brien).
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Arguments

2
3 No claims are canceled or added by this Reply. Hence, claims 1-20
4 continue to be presented for examination. Of claims 1-20, claims 1, 6, 9, 13, 19,
5 and 20 are independent.

6
7 All of the rejections are based at least partly on Williams et al. (U.S. Patent
8 5,845,283).

9
10 It is believed that all six (6) independent claims have been amended in
11 accordance with the discussions of the Examiner Interview in manners to
12 differentiate them from Williams et al.

13
14
15 Remarks Regarding Williams et al.

16
17 [1] The data conversion device of Williams et al. is an integrated,
18 monolithic device.

19 More specifically, the description of Williams et al. reads:

20 As best seen in FIG. 3A the data conversion device 22 uses a unique
21 message interface (MI) to process each supported record format. When the data
22 conversion device 22 receives a record, *the appropriate MI uses a conversion*
23 *engine 23 embedded in the data conversion device 22 to translate the record*
24 *data from the input format to a desired Universal Data Format (UDF)*, which
25 may be an industry specific format. As described in more detail below with
reference to FIG. 3B, the conversion engine 23, according to the invention,
preferably includes a super-record storage 23a for holding data streams during

1 the conversion processes and, for storage of the data conversion rules applicable
2 to the various message interface devices, a library storage 23b. More
3 specifically, it is the library 23b which contains the conversion rules applicable
4 to the field of UDF(s).

5 (Column 5, Lines 1-15; *italicized emphasis added*)

6 Consequently, there is no loading of any module that is capable of
7 conversion in the description or teachings of Williams et al.

8 [2] Although there are multiple different logical message interfaces
9 (MIs) in Williams et al., there is only a single conversion module.

10 More specifically, FIGS. 3A and 3B include a single "conversion routine
11 library 23a". For example, the description of Williams et al. reads:

12 The library 23a contains the conversion routines. Examples of
13 conversion routines found in the library 23a are an ASCII-to-EBCDIC routine, or
14 a date conversion routine.

15 [...]

16 2) The conversion routine library 23a is then called on to convert a date
17 field and a time field. The routines in the library 23a will convert the date field
18 and time field to the UDF format.

19 [...]

20 5) The conversion routine library 23a is called on to make the date field
21 and time field conversion.

22 (Column 6, Lines 44-46; Column 6, Lines 59-62; and Column 7, Lines 3-4)

23 Consequently, there is neither description nor teaching in Williams et al. of
24 a plug-in module that is capable of performing a conversion.
25

1 Remarks Regarding the Claims

2 It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable over the art
3 of record, both individually and in any combination.

4
5 For example, with respect to claim 1, it includes elements directed to a
6 plug-in module that is adapted to parse and convert data and that may be loaded by
7 a parsing engine, with the parsing engine receiving the converted data.

8
9 Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that there is adequate support for
10 the earlier claim amendments to claim 6. Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution
11 and the ultimate issuance of the instant Application as a U.S. Patent, the noted
12 language has been removed from claim 6. It is respectfully requested that the 112
13 rejection and the Specification objection (on page 2 of the current Office Action)
14 both be withdrawn.

1 Remarks Regarding O'Brien et al.

2
3 The current Office Action reads on pages 6 and 7 at paragraph #19, in
4 pertinent part:

5 Williams does not specifically teach the log is a test log. However,
6 O'Brien taught a test log (column 13, lines 1-13). It would have been obvious to
7 one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that
8 incorporating O'Brien's test log in Williams system for rationalizing different
9 data formats would have improved system utility.

10 Even assuming, *arguendo*, (i) that O'Brien teaches the concept of test logs
11 and (ii) that Williams et al. and O'Brien et al. may be combined as indicated in the
12 current Office Action, such an assertion and combination does not remedy the
13 above-described deficiencies of Williams et al.

14
15
16 Remarks Regarding the Dependent Claims

17
18 Reasons for the allowability of independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 13 have been
19 provided above. Claims 2-5, 7-8, 10-12, and 14-18 depend directly or indirectly
20 from these independent claims 1, 6, 9, and 13, respectively. Although each also
21 includes additional element(s) militating toward allowability, these dependent claims
22 are allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection with their respective
23 independent claims.
24
25

1
2
3 **CONCLUSION**
4

5 It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 1-20 are allowable. It is
6 therefore respectfully requested that the Office pass the instant Patent Application
7 to issue with all due haste.
8

9 Respectfully Submitted,
10

11 Date: 2/9/2006
12

13 By: Keith W. Saunders
14 Keith W. Saunders
15 Reg. No. 41,462
16 (509) 324-9256 x238
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25